

The A. F. of L. Weekly News Service gives a brief summary of important matters affecting labor, including the industrial, legislative, and judicial sides, and other information that will benefit the trade union movement.

AMERICAN LABOR

WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

WASHINGTON, D. C. SATURDAY, APRIL 22, 1922.

AGITATE!
EDUCATE!
ORGANIZE!

VOL. 12, NO. 5.

WHOLE NO. 576.

GOVERNMENT IS NOT NEUTRAL, COAL OWNERS ARE AIDED

The power of government is behind federal injunctions that now plaster the mining sections of West Virginia.

Most of these injunctions are in support of the individual coal owner, which the government is making its employees sign before they give them work.

In this contract the worker agrees not to join union while so employed. This contract was upheld by the United States supreme court in December, 1917, in the case of *Hitchman vs. miners*.

Since then West Virginia coal owners, especially, have used this method of aid to the government in their war on the Miners' union under the guise of maintaining the right of contract.

There can be no greater mockery than to call these forced pledges "contract." Miners contemptuously refer to it as a "yellow dog." It violates the very element of contract making—that both parties

to a contract must be free agents; that there must be an absence of force or intimidation, and that the signing of a contract must be a voluntary act by both parties.

Who will say that the elements of contract making apply to miners in the mountains of West Virginia, who, with their families, are far removed from industrial centers?

The miner cannot offer his services as does the worker in populated centers. His choice is limited to mining that is controlled by a small group of men who act together.

Who will say that under these conditions contract making is equal and the miner is a free agent when he is told that he will not be given work unless he signs a contract to join a trade union while so employed?

Nothing shows the coal owner is free from intimidation when he knows that if the miner does not sign his wife and children will starve.

Nothing shows the property bias of the judicial

power more clearly than the *Hitchman* decision, which overturns former contract decisions.

In the enforcement of contracts courts have consistently held that the parties must have free will; that there must be no element of force, coercion or undue advantage.

In the *Hitchman* case the United States supreme court ignored these fundamentals and it is so often declared for. As a result, the *Hitchman* coal and coke company, and its kind, can now hold employees in servitude with the aid of the federal judiciary.

There is neither morality, ethics, justice or elemental law in the "yellow dog." It is based on the hunger of babies and needs of women, and men men by forcing them to agree not to do things that they have a lawful right to do, which every impulse calls upon them to do.

It is a judgment, one-sided and unfair. It can only be sustained by men steeped in hypocrisy and idealism.

This is the contract that is general in West Virginia, and which injunction judges are rushing to enforce. These judges are backed by every power of government and can enforce it.

government is neutral in the miners' struggle for a living wage and sustaining employment.

What can be the thought of these miners who listened but a few years ago to a ship agent's tale of a land across the ocean where all men are free?

Now these miners see the government of that free land upholding a greedy coal owner's power advantage of the needs of babies and forced their father to sign a pledge that he would join the Miners' union.

They see that government warning trade unions that they will be fined and jailed if they talk organization to miners who surrendered their lawful right and accepted a "yellow dog" because they were forced to do so.

Courts may talk about the "sacredness" of these "contracts." Lawmakers may remain silent about the injustice of the "yellow dog" and the inequity of injunction judges, but the men who risk their lives while in this servitude will talk each other if the ship agent told him he was free.

What progress can genuine Americanism make among these workers when they ask that question?

Check Tent-Smashing Judge; Coal Owners' Aid Is Rebuffed

McClintic Besmirches Judiciary By Order To Drive Striking Miners and Families From Their Tent Homes.

Richmond, Va., April 22.—Federal Judge McClintic's injunction to smash the Mingo tent colony has been ordered held up by Hon. Martin A. Knapp, judge of the federal court of appeals, fourth circuit.

Judge Knapp's decision says this order: "It can be heard by the court of appeals. McClintic is also ordered to scrap his injunction machine until the court of appeals reviews his acts."

Several years ago this federal law permit the prosecution of appeals, and take a man charged with crime out of his own county into another county for trial.

Under this law, which is now in effect, the trial of a striking miner can be transferred to a county like Logan, which is under the complete domination of Baldwin.

When McClintic was appointed last year the A. F. of L. made the objection that the law in favor of coal owners. The latest exhibition of this bias was shown by his issuance of an injunction that would cut hundreds of miners and their families from their tent homes, and drive them to a place where they are located on land leased by the union.

The coal owners made no progress in blocking McClintic's order, but the miners' families are now in the hands of the law.

McClintic is recognized as the author of the West Virginia law that gave the coal owner the right to hire and fire.

PROFITS CAN BUY ENTIRE PLANT IN FOUR YEARS, SAYS UNIONIST

Boston, April 22.—In the last generation the Pacific textile mills have paid its stockholders in cash the par value of its capitalization year and a half times over, says Thomas F. McMahon, president of the United Textile Workers, in an open letter to Edwin Farnham Green, president of the Pacific Mills.

This company is attempting to lower wages and its employees are on strike.

"The public who bought the cloth and the operatives who have made it," said the trade union executive, "have contributed to the profits of the Pacific Mills in proportion to the value of the par value of its capitalization four or five times over in the last generation."

The letter calls attention to the widely advertised claim that competition for the reduction of certain goods is not in the hands of the Pacific Mills, but in the hands of the Pacific Mills, which is the fact that the Pacific Mills has part of its factory property in Columbia, S. C., and asks: "Are you in any way using your influence to bring about an increase in the wages of southern cotton mill workers, or do you believe that the Pacific Mills is a company that is north and south is the best way to determine what wages shall be in the southern and northern mills?"

President McMahon says that the position that "wages are determined by the market" is a reduction of the burden of depression, and asks: "Do you believe that the workers in Pacific Mills are likewise entitled to a large share of the benefit of productivity?"

RAIL INJUNCTION DISSOLVED

Baltimore, April 22.—Federal Judge Rose has dissolved his temporary injunction against Western Maryland Railway Company, which was issued to prevent the company from striking its employees.

The company had been on strike since it was ordered to pay its employees a wage increase of 10 percent.

The company had been on strike since it was ordered to pay its employees a wage increase of 10 percent.

In a signed statement, President Byers of the Western Maryland Railway Company stated that when he received the injunction, he was "very much surprised" and that he had "immediately" applied to the court for its dissolution.

He stated that the company had been on strike since it was ordered to pay its employees a wage increase of 10 percent.

He stated that the company had been on strike since it was ordered to pay its employees a wage increase of 10 percent.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

The court's action, however, is notable in two features:—It is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress, and it is the first time a federal judge has dissolved his injunction while a strike is in progress.

Government Aided Railroad Builders

"Whose Record Is 'Blot Upon History'"

Washington, April 22.—In the Southern Pacific railroad dissolution suit before the United States supreme court, Solicitor General Beach declared that the transaction by which C. P. Huntington and his associates leased the Central Pacific to the Southern Pacific, was a "blot upon the history of the country."

The government's attorney referred to Huntington and his associates as "the big four." He said they received government aid for the construction of the Central Pacific to such an extent that they built the Pacific, though they never paid for it.

After they unloaded this stock they leased the Central Pacific to the Southern Pacific, which they secured control of.

The purpose of this transaction, the government holds, was to dispose of all their interests in the Central Pacific and then, when they were no longer financially interested in it, to turn it over to the Southern Pacific, which they would then control.

In reviewing the juggling of this railroad property, the government's representative declared that the transaction was a "blot upon the history of the country."

He said that the government had been deceived by the "big four" and that the government had been deceived by the "big four" and that the government had been deceived by the "big four."

TRANSPORTATION ACT TECHNICAL MEN IGNORED BY MANAGERS

Chicago, April 22.—"It was the intention of the transportation act that railway workers shall receive a living wage, but if their wage is not increased, they will be forced to leave the industry," declared a technical man.

He said that the government had been deceived by the "big four" and that the government had been deceived by the "big four" and that the government had been deceived by the "big four."

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

The government, in turn, will give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

This means that the government will pay \$3 for every \$5 received. It would be cheaper for the government to give the ship owners a direct subsidy of \$300,000 a year for 10 years.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

Washington, April 22.—A small group of financial "insiders," according to the latest circulation of the "yellow dog" contract, are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.

They are the ones who are making the most money out of the strike.